

North Carolina Wireless 911 Board
MINUTES
December 2, 2005

Guest

Jim Albright, Guilford County

Erin Ford, Pictometry

Phillip Penny

Alan Perdue, Guilford County

Scott Sherwood, Pictometry

Gary Thomas, Union County 911

Rebecca Troutman, NCACC

Donna Wright, Union County 911

Richard Bradford DOJ
Leslie Tripp ITS

Chairman Steve Stoneman called the meeting to order at 10:02 AM and welcomed everyone. He welcomed and introduced Bob Smith, who was sitting in for Richard Bradford. Richard Taylor also advised the Board that Leslie Tripp would not be in attendance, as her mother's health was rapidly failing to such a degree that she might not survive the weekend. He added that Leslie had gone to Greensboro Thursday morning to stay with her.

Ethics Awareness/Conflict of Interest Statement:

Chairman Stoneman read the Conflict Of Interest Statement and asked if anyone had any conflicts. None were cited.

Approval of minutes

Chairman Stoneman asked for comments or corrections to the previous meeting minutes, and hearing none, asked for a motion to accept them as written. Joe Durham so moved, David Keever seconded, and the motion carried.

Executive Director's Field Report

Richard Taylor reported on progress taking the 911 Funding Seminars across the state. He noted that attendance and comments have been excellent. He found it interesting that in several instances, when the slide about fund balances came up, the looks exchanged between finance directors and PSAP directors representing the same entity clearly indicated a lack of shared information and understanding between them. He reported that we have had representation from every invited PSAP jurisdiction except three, noting that there was a conflict on the same date as one of our presentations out west. Haywood County, Macon County, and Yadkin County did not send any representatives to our presentation in their areas. He said that presentations next week in Richmond County and Wake County will be the last presentations this year. Chairman Stoneman asked if he had a time frame for completion of the round of seminars, and Richard replied that he hoped to complete them by the end of February, doing two a week as schedule allows. Richard also pointed out that the numbers on the map in the agenda book represent the number of attendees from each county, noting several strong showings.

Richard reported that he had spoken at the Illinois Public Safety Telecommunications Association Conference in Springfield, IL, considering that quite an honor. He also reported attending the bimonthly Board meeting of the NCGIC (North Carolina Geographic Information Council), where he heard an interesting presentation on how GIS folks from North Carolina assisted in the Katrina response.

Trainer's Field Report

Ron Adams summarized his report, including the classes he had presented since the last Board meeting, the fact that he had been accompanying Richard to the 911 Fund Seminars, and continued maintenance of the website. He added that in response to two highly critical class evaluations he had reviewed his Wireless 911 for Telecommunicator PowerPoint presentation and made some adjustments to address concerns cited in those evaluations. He said he felt the changes had been well received at the classes he has held since making them, based upon favorable class evaluations from those classes. Chairman Stoneman told him not to worry about a few bad comments because "this is a continual improvement process and that's why we do it."

Chairman Stoneman then asked Ron if he had made any progress regarding posting a video of his class presentation on the website. Ron said that he had met with

representatives from the North Carolina Information Highway division of ITS regarding creating such a video in the spring. He explained that he had hoped to, but had not as yet, come up with an approach more interesting than just a video of him on one side of a split screen and the PowerPoint slides on the other.

Chairman Stoneman asked him to get a cost figure and a time frame to put something together by the next Board meeting, including perhaps a short demo. He added that he felt having the video out on the website where visitors can just click to get the latest information would be very beneficial. That would allow telecommunicators access to any updates more quickly than if they had to wait for Ron to bring an updated class to their centers. Ron said he would work toward having something by the next meeting.

North Carolina Open Meetings Law Compliance

In early October the Attorney General's office sent a letter to all State agencies regarding North Carolina's open meetings law. Richard Taylor included a copy of that letter and the accompanying Advisory Opinion in today's agenda book for Board member review. He noted that the letter and the opinion stress the importance of knowing when a Board can go into closed session, but added that this Board has only done so once, when he was hired.

Consideration of Request from Guilford County for Approval of Funding for Pictometry

Richard Taylor referred Board members to a copy of a letter from Guilford County requesting the Board to allow use of Wireless 911 surcharge money to partially pay for the implementation of Pictometry in its jurisdiction. He introduced meeting guests Alan Perdue, Guilford County Emergency Services Director, and Jim Albright, Guilford County Emergency Services Deputy Director, as well as Scott Sherwood and Erin Ford from Pictometry. Richard briefly reviewed the Board's history with Pictometry, including an initial decision by the Board to approach any funding requests on a case by case basis. Six different counties to date have made requests to fund Pictometry. Richard said he has returned five of those requests because he felt they did not have enough justification to meet the requirements of the statute. He added that, in fact, this was the second letter from Guilford County. He returned the first one, and they came back with a second justification.

Alan Perdue addressed the Board saying he was not a technical person, and would defer to the Pictometry representatives for answers to any technical questions. He further explained that "...we're all about service...about 'How do we provide the best possible service to the county, the citizens of our county, and visitors to our county?'" He said that they look at Pictometry as a tool to help them "identify the location of a (911) caller, as with other CAD and E911 Phase II" tools. He noted that many phones are still not Phase II capable, but that the callers using them still must be located. He also mentioned how many transient people pass through the county on its many major highways, and how they frequently don't know where they are when they need emergency help.

Richard Taylor related to the Board that he had learned at the last NCGICC meeting that the NC Board of Examiners for Engineers and Surveyors had developed a policy addressing oblique aerial imaging. In short, that policy interpreted oblique aerial imaging as falling within the definition of the practice of land surveying, and would require any entity practicing that type of work in North Carolina be licensed by that Board.

Joe Durham then asked what the total funding amount of the request was, not just that 75% of the total project be eligible for the use of wireless 911 funds. Richard Taylor deferred to Alan Perdue, who said the initial quote was in the neighborhood of 375-400 thousand dollars. Joe then asked if that meant the wireless 911 fund would pay 75% of that amount, and if the subcommittee was aware of that amount in its deliberations. Belinda Gurkins clarified that the money would come from Guilford County's 911 fund balance, not directly from the Wireless Board.

Chairman Stoneman observed the key point to remember is whether or not Pictometry is a technology that is eligible for funding, and that is a decision that needs to come from the Board. He added that must be the primary factor before considering funding models, funding impacts, etc.

Frank Thomason reported that the subcommittee, comprised of Carolyn Carter, Betty Dobson, David Keever, and him, held a lengthy teleconference regarding this issue, looking at it from more than just the perspective of the Guilford County request. Richard Taylor, Richard Bradford, and Bob Smith also participated. He observed that the committee recognized that technology has continued to evolve and change over time to better identify and locate callers. The committee members felt it was incumbent upon them to consider these improvements when coming to a decision.

Frank stated that the committee members agreed that new technologies such as oblique imaging will unquestionably be beneficial for identifying and locating wireless callers. The question is how to fit them to the present statute, or how/whether to revise the statute to accommodate them.

The committee felt the initial issue to address was the licensure requirement cited above. Frank observed that he was confident Pictometry would comply with whatever legal requirements were necessary to conduct business in North Carolina. But he added that until that issue was satisfactorily resolved, the Board couldn't decide upon the other issues.

Carolyn Carter made the distinction that she understood the committee discussions to conclude that "the Board needs to look at whether we need to tweak this (the statute) or not," not to recommend that the statute be changed. She observed that one of the committee recommendations (number 2) printed on the committee recommendation states that the Board should recommend the legislation be changed, not that change should simply be considered. That is not what she understood the committee had decided, and wanted to be clear about that.

Belinda Gurkins then asked for some clarification on what kind of changes are being considered: "Are we talking about the dispatching piece of it versus the receiving as far as the call itself?" She noted that the Board has taken a firm stance in the past on

“everything else, as far as dispatching,” and that she thinks the Board “needs to think really hard on how we do that.” Frank replied that he didn’t think the committee disagrees with that at all. He also said that once that is determined, the third issue to contemplate would be “to what degree of the percentage breakdowns is it allowable.” Belinda added, “And how much does that open it up to everything else that we’ve not considered in the past because of it being on the dispatch side.”

Richard Taylor related that Carolyn Carter made the point in the conference call that wireless money already funds GIS, and that if funding of Pictometry were allowed, what would the financial impact be with the funding mechanism currently in place. How is that going to impact the PSAP? What will the overall impact be statewide? Carolyn added, “Just to expand upon that a little bit, the way I was looking at that was this is almost an equal consideration. It’s not a matter of making these two decisions and then looking at the cost.” She felt we need to be looking at the cost at the same time because it simply may not be feasible, whatever else we think about it.

Joe Durham noted that we have three recommendations from the subcommittee, and commended the subcommittee for its work. He said that he thought the first recommendation needs to be decided separate from the second and third. He asked that the Board take action on the first recommendation first, then have discussion about what action we take subsequent to that.

Chairman Stoneman asked if that should be made into a motion to say that these types of technologies need to be licensed by the Board of Examiners. Frank Thomason replied that he thinks that licensing is still up in the air at this point, based upon a presentation Pictometry recently made to the Board of Examiners. In response to that presentation a subcommittee of the surveying board was convened to review whether licensure was really necessary in this case.

At this point Scott Sherwood, Vice President of Corporate Marketing Initiatives for Pictometry, spoke to the issue. He related that Pictometry went through a virtually identical process in Florida last year which determined that since Pictometry was not base mapping, a surveying license was not necessary. He provided the North Carolina Board of Examiners legal documentation of that finding at a meeting he had with them yesterday (Thursday 12/1), and they indicated that they hoped to provide a decision by the end of next week. He added that if the Board of Examiners determines that it wants Pictometry to be licensed, Pictometry will comply. They absolutely do not intend to proceed without the proper approval.

Chairman Stoneman observed to Joe Durham that it seems like a determination on that matter would need to be made before moving ahead with Joe’s suggestion that this Board make a decision based upon the subcommittee’s recommendation number one. Joe replied that he still has a question in his mind, as has been raised by others, about whether or not this is an acceptable use of 911 funds. He said he would love to have someone convince him or show him that it is, as he believes the technology offers great benefit, but at this point he’s not convinced. Based on that, Joe recommended that the request for the oblique imaging product from Pictometry be denied because it is not an acceptable use of wireless 911 funds as defined in General Statutes at this time.

Chairman Stoneman asked if that was a motion, and Joe replied yes. Chairman Stoneman then offered a suggestion, saying "Clearly we cannot act now in any kind of approval. It seems like there is still a fair amount of work that needs to be done in terms of getting the results from the Board of Examiners position as it relates to item one, determining whether or not we do indeed need to go ahead and make any legislation changes, as it says in item two, and the key thing that Joe mentioned from a financial standpoint: is this financially do-able, from the fund balance and so forth? And I think the fourth thing we need to add is to address Belinda's concerns about identification/location versus dispatch. So it seems there is more work for the subcommittee to do here."

Bob Smith then reminded Chairman Stoneman that there was a motion on the floor from the committee, and that according to Robert's Rules of Order the committee would have to agree to the substitute (Joe Durham's motion). Leigh Horner asked "I just want to make sure I understand that the reason that we don't believe at this point that, it doesn't fall under 62A-25 is because of the call-taking versus dispatch. Is that the main issue?" She added she doesn't understand why it wouldn't qualify at this point, why the distinction between oblique imaging and GIS. She said that the next time the Board discusses it she wants to be sure she understands that.

Richard Taylor responded, deferring to Bob Smith from the AG's office, who was also present during the teleconference, for an answer to the question, "Does it, or does it not, fit 62-A?" Bob said that while he would defer to Richard Bradford, personally, he felt it was a great idea, but in terms of whether it actually fits the statute, he thought there was "some pretty good question." He added that if change were necessary, the Board could certainly ask the legislature to make a change. He mentioned that one of the things the subcommittee discussed was that if "someone didn't have any sort of method for mapping out, Pictometry certainly might be the basic method for identifying where somebody is. But where there is already a method for identifying location, then this seems to be an add-on or secondary, and as such, would not be contemplated as covered by the statute." He added, "But as a Board, you have a right to interpret your statute, and it seems to me you have the obligation to be consistent with what you've done with the statute. But I think Richard's (Bradford) feeling is that as it's interpreted and written now, it would not be a covered use."

Leigh Horner then posed the question that if, at an interval when an agency would upgrade its GIS application in a normal maintenance cycle, it instead moved to Pictometry, would that be considered an upgrade or an enhancement? Richard Taylor replied that he thinks that is exactly the question that has been put before us. Most of the requests that he has gotten thus far have indicated they are using Pictometry in addition to their GIS. He added that as he told the folks from Pictometry, and as he has told the Board before, he looks at oblique imaging as next generation GIS. He said, "I think it is slick. I think it brings a lot to the table." He and Richard Bradford have studied that part of the statute that says "in accordance with the FCC order," which refers to the part of 94-102 that says "receive and utilize the data." The data with a wireless call is latitude and longitude, so "it doesn't say 'receive the data as well as any information that the caller may give you,' and again we're...you kinda get into, some people would say, splitting hairs, but that's what our lawyers do." Richard added that Richard Bradford's

interpretation is that you're not using the data received from the cell phone, you're getting other data, so this doesn't fit 94-102. Richard Taylor said he looks at it as, if you have Pictometry, and it is the only form of location, and the location plots to a picture instead of a map, it's still utilizing the data.

David Keever asked for a clarification of the request from Guilford County, and Richard Taylor replied it was to approve the funding. David then speculated that what's been presented is not currently in compliance with state law, so "it's an easy thing." David added that it certainly was not a problem with Pictometry, but simply that what has been presented today is not currently compliant.

Chairman Stoneman asked Joe Durham to restate the motion. Joe summarized that the subcommittee offers three recommendations, and that he made the request that we look at those separately, starting with the first one. His motion was "to deny the request from Guilford County for funding for the oblique imaging product because it has not been shown to be an acceptable use of the wireless 911 fund as defined in General Statute 62A-25." Chairman Stoneman asked if there was a second, and Don Van Liew seconded. Chairman Stoneman asked if there was any further discussion, and Betty Dobson asked for clarification that this did not deny the request for ever, that it was going to come back up. Chairman Stoneman assured her that was correct.

At this point Richard Taylor offered a clarification that the recommendation from the subcommittee is considered a motion. Bob Smith agreed, adding that technically the committee would have to agree to the substitute motion offered by Joe Durham. Carolyn Carter observed that Joe's wording was different. Betty Dobson asked if what she understood, that the committee recommendation cited three actions, and Joe's motion was to decide on the first one before the other two rather than acting on all three at once, was correct. Joe confirmed that was his intent. He also added that he feels action needs to be taken rather than going with no action due to the unresolved licensure status. He feels that Guilford County deserves a response at this time. He added that he would be willing to amend his motion to say that "it's denied based upon further review and evaluation of the General Statute, or something along those lines," if that would make people feel better.

Carolyn then asked to suggest an amendment to the motion. She suggested "that the first line, where it says 'be denied until...etc.'" be replaced with "until further consideration by the Board if the product...etc." Joe Durham then added, "I think we're spending perhaps too much time, with all due respect," and "I think, I'm looking around and I can read faces pretty good, that there is no groundswell to approve this at this stage, so deny the request from Guilford County, and I would offer this as another motion that we deny currently the request from Guilford County." Leigh Horner and David Keever seconded the motion simultaneously.

Chairman Stoneman asked if that was acceptable with the committee. Seeing a nodding of heads, he asked if there was any further discussion. He noted that the "key is that we have to take action on the request for funding today. So, the motion is to deny that request today. And if the committee is comfortable with that, and obviously there is a lot more work that needs to be done, so this is going to be brought up at the next meeting

for sure.” The subcommittee indicated that was acceptable. The vote was called, and the motion carried.

Before moving on, Chairman Stoneman asked “that the subcommittee regroup and address the remaining issues and come back to the Board at the next meeting to respond and address whether or not we need to have any legislation changes, to do a financial analysis of the impact should this be approved, and present that to the Board. And finally to address, I think it’s Belinda’s concern, about the issue of dispatch versus location.” Chief Cherry added that he also thinks more discussion needs to take place among all the Board members, not just the committee members. Chairman Stoneman agreed, but he’s depending upon the subcommittee to gather the facts to support the discussion at the next meeting. Don Van Liew underscored that they were not coming back with a recommendation, but with information. Pam Tope asked that within the financial analysis the cost of updates be addressed, not just original project costs. Chairman Stoneman asked Frank Thomason to summarize the action items for the committee, send an e-mail to the Board members, and solicit any further input from them.

Report from the North Carolina Board of Ethics

Richard Taylor reported that the Board of Ethics letters for Betty Dobson and Robert Cherry showed no conflict of interest, but that the potential for conflict of interest is present. That is always the case based upon Board members being professionals in fields impacted by wireless 911. The letters were included in the agenda to meet the requirement that they be read into the minutes.

Discussion on funding of Burke County

Chairman Stoneman asked Richard Taylor if we could proceed with this agenda item without Leslie Tripp, who was listed on the agenda as the presenter. Richard replied that he would try to do that. He noted that he and Leslie had gone to Burke County after the last Board meeting and met with staff there. He added, “We went with the intention that we weren’t leaving until we got what we needed.” They spent that afternoon pursuing that goal, and got everything up until this past year (FY 2003-2004). Richard and Leslie had some questions regarding information for this past year that was not readily available, but were able to get up to date with all of Burke’s earlier audit information. We are still waiting for that information, but with the anticipation that it will be available in the near future, and since the Board had taken the action a while back to cut off funding, Leslie wanted to make the recommendations listed in the agenda book.

Chairman Stoneman asked if this started back in 2001, and Richard said actually it was 2002, although the report was for 2001. Leigh Horner asked if the amounts the paid out of their 911 fund that were not allowable had been reimbursed. Richard replied that up until 2004 those have been reimbursed, i.e. that everything up until this past year’s audit (2004) has been corrected. Chairman Stoneman said, “So all the ineligible expenses that were taken out of the fund up to 2004 have now been replenished back into the fund?” Richard replied yes. Frank Thomason made a motion that the board accept the staff recommendation, and Chief Cherry seconded the motion.

When Chairman Stoneman asked for discussion, Frank Thomason said that he “agreed with Leslie’s second bullet, that these audits are extremely important to this Board, and that’s why we have them, and if we don’t show and keep some teeth in place, then it opens it wide open and we cannot afford that.” Don Van Liew asked Bob Smith (counsel) if we have the right to do that, and Bob said, “My assumption is that since the Board voted to withhold it at the advice of Richard Bradford, that the Board has the right to do that.”

Chairman Stoneman asked if there was any further discussion. Don Van Liew then observed that the action the Board took at the time was to stop disbursement, not to stop it and then give it back once they complied. He surmised that once the requested information was provided, then the disbursements would start again, but said he couldn’t remember whether or not the motion to stop disbursements specifically spelled that out. Richard said he would have to go back and look at the motion. Chairman Stoneman reminded everyone that only after multiple repeated attempts to get the information did the Board take that action. David Keever asked if the July 1 date in the recommendation was an arbitrary date. Richard replied that it was, but the reasoning was that July 1 starts a new fiscal year. Leigh Horner then asked, “So what you’re saying Don, though, is we stopped it, that we should not even reinstate back to July 1, 2005. We stopped it and it doesn’t reinstate until we’ve approved it and we just start it up again, kind of on the timeline that we’re on. Don agreed, “We stopped it, and we’ll start it when we vote to start again. That’s when it starts.”

Chairman Stoneman clarified “What we’re saying here, now, is that we’ll reinstate it as of July 1 this year.” He asked for further discussion, and Leigh asked, “Are there any other counties that we have stopped payment on and restarted when they provided us the information?” Richard said yes, that we had done that with Anson County and had gotten an immediate response. Chairman Stoneman again asked if there was any further discussion. Belinda Gurkins then said that she felt we should, “like she (Rebecca) recommended,” make a policy stating specifically that withheld funds will not be reimbursed to prevent any entity from even contemplating it will receive a refund of withheld funds once it complies with Board requests. Richard Taylor said he would make note that we need to review that policy with Richard Bradford, and Frank Thomason said he would amend his motion to reflect that.

Chairman Stoneman asked Frank to restate the amended motion, and Frank said, “To accept the staff recommendation and also for staff to review the current procedures in place for reinstatement of funds.” Chairman Stoneman asked for a second to the amended motion, and Joe Durham seconded. The motion was called, and carried unanimously.

Discussion of Proposals for Presentation to Joint Utility Review Committee

Richard Taylor began by reminding the Board that at the last Board meeting Chairman Stoneman had suggested that the Board be proactive in providing information to the Joint Utility Review Committee convened to review the topics listed in Section 11.(a) of the NCGS 62-A revision legislation passed this year (Session Law 2005-439).

Chairman Stoneman reiterated how important he believes it is that this Board play as much of an active role in working with this committee as possible. For the Board to offer its services, experience, and advice would be extremely beneficial. He reminded everyone that we had initially discussed drafting a letter to send to that committee offering those services and making ourselves available. He asked the Board for its feelings about that.

Chairman Stoneman reiterated how important it is to stay engaged with this committee, and that what we're looking for here is really a letter of introduction, very simple, very straightforward, "We're here, we're here to help." Hopefully that will turn into an invitation to report on the status of wireless, etc. Chairman Stoneman asked Richard to draft such a letter, and Joe Durham said, "And the letter will state what? That generally there's an interest in..." Richard continued, "Offering our resources to the committee to call upon us, you know, and our experience with Wireless 911, dealing with 128 PSAPs. We offer up, nothing against NENA and APCO, but that we have a more direct contact than a lot of associations, the same way that Sprint doesn't know about all 128 PSAPs and neither does BellSouth, that kind of thing."

Chairman Stoneman said he had been advised (by counsel) that this probably should be in the form of a motion. Leigh Horner so moved, Frank Thomason seconded, the motion was called, and it carried unanimously. Chairman Stoneman asked Richard to send a draft to the Board before sending it out.

Chairman Stoneman suggested the Board go through each of the discussion points in the agenda packet, then perhaps vote on whether or not to address each one to the committee. He asked Richard to explain a little bit of the history behind why he selected each of these topics, then put each one to an up or down vote. Pam Tope, Belinda Gurkins, and then several other members around the table indicated they were not prepared to vote on any of these items. Pam said she would prefer a period of discussion, solicit feedback, then come back to the next meeting before voting. Chairman Stoneman agreed to that, adding that after Richard presents these items, he would entertain any other suggestions the Board had as well.

Richard then touched upon each of the 8 items listed in the agenda packet:

1. He suggested perhaps a VoIP carrier representative and a State Emergency Management representative be added to the Wireless Board. Although VoIP is not wireless, it behaves like wireless, and a liaison with the VoIP community could be invaluable in helping us develop a mechanism for collecting 911 surcharges from VoIP providers. Richard also observed that many of the PSAPs in the state operate under Emergency Management, and that many things in Emergency Management happen within the 911 community, so it seems a good fit for them to be represented on the Board.
2. The thrust of Richard's summation for redefining the 911 system was acknowledging the changes in technology that have occurred since the legislation was crafted, and possibly rethinking acceptable use based upon these technological improvements. Discussion around the table included members' interpretations of justifiable acceptable use, especially why it was limited to telephone equipment and services. Chairman Stoneman observed that perhaps

this discussion could result in a completely different funding model. Richard agreed, saying that his personal opinion of the funding model on the wireline side is that it is totally outdated, and a new model needs to be developed.

3. Richard simply stated that comprehensive plans from PSAPs could greatly help in determining the relative effectiveness of 911 in both 'have' and 'have not' PSAPs. Chairman Stoneman added that understanding each PSAP's approach might disclose ways to streamline 911, preventing PSAPs from having to 'reinvent the wheel,' with potential savings across the board.
4. Richard referred back to his earlier statement regarding the wireline/wireless distinction, "if it's 911, it's 911, it's 911," regardless of whether it's wireless or wireline.
5. One of the issues the legislation calls for the committee to look at is a uniform 911 charge, or flat rate for any type of access to 911. The current wireline surcharge model, which allows local governments to assess and collect whatever surcharge amount they deem necessary, obviously would no longer work.
6. To accommodate a flat rate, a central authority, arguably at a State level, would have to administer it to equitably disburse funds to all PSAPs, large or small, much like the Wireless 911 Board does for Wireless 911 at this time. One option might be that if there were statewide standards for CAD or GIS systems, the State could directly pay for any part of any PSAP's CAD or GIS meeting those standards, while the PSAP would be responsible for any enhancements above and beyond those standards. It wouldn't matter whose product it was, as long as it met the standards.
7. Expanding the use of 911 funds to those functions directly related to the operation of the 911 system could include training, for example, as well as other uses.
8. A managed network created by whomever, whether telcos or independent companies could streamline connectivity by maybe requiring carriers to connect to only two selective routers rather than eighteen. That could save on trunk costs, as well as provide the ability to transfer both voice and data among distant PSAPs. Emerging technologies practically demand this type of network.

Chairman Stoneman asked members to contribute any other ideas to Richard within a week from now, then he could distribute an updated list for everyone to consider so that each one can be put to a vote at the next meeting.

Status of Phase I and Phase II Wireless 911 in North Carolina

Ron Adams mentioned that the CMRS report for SunCom had been included due to going very quickly from 39 PSAPs in North Carolina to 60 as a result of the corporate merger between AT&T and Cingular earlier in the year. He touched upon individual PSAP Phase I deployment issues as listed in the agenda book, noting that PSAPs and providers alike seemed to be actively working to resolve them. He noted that the Wireless Report Card showed only incremental changes, with build-outs and requests for service moving percentages up and down to where they essentially balanced out. Chairman Stoneman asked how percentages could drop, and Ron replied it was a function of build-outs versus deployments. He closed by noting that the Wireless Phase II Requests documenting request and deployment dates were as up to date as he currently has information for, with blank fields indicating a lack of any such information.

Approval of Meeting Dates for 2006

Chairman Stoneman asked for a motion to accept the dates listed. Belinda Gurkins so moved, David Keever seconded, and the motion carried.

Administrative Reports

Richard Taylor touched on each of the financial reports Leslie provided in the agenda book, as well as the updated Board roster. Belinda Gurkins asked why funds were being withheld from Martin County, and Richard replied it was at their request. They had misspent funds that they couldn't reimburse, so they asked to have their disbursements applied to that debt until it was cleared up. Pam Tope mentioned she couldn't find the Burke County balance, and Richard agreed, as Leslie had it blank. Richard said he would have to get together with Leslie to get that information, and Chairman Stoneman asked him to get that out to the Board as soon as he did.

Adjourn

Chairman Stoneman asked if there was any other business to come before the Board. Hearing none, he asked for a motion for adjournment. David Keever so moved, Frank Thomason seconded, and the motion carried. Chairman Stoneman closed by wishing everyone "Happy Holidays."